

**To:** Abrahm Lustgarten[Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org]  
**From:** Johnson, Alisha  
**Sent:** Fri 6/21/2013 2:09:43 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Pavillion, WY

Will get back to you on 2 & 7, but here are responses to the others:

**1. Why is the EPA turning over the investigation to Wyoming officials, without completing its peer review process or reaching a final conclusion?**

We have been working with the State throughout our groundwater investigation and are pleased that the State is exercising leadership on the next phase of investigation. At this stage, partnering with the State of Wyoming is the quickest and most effective way to protect public health and drinking water resources of the residents of Pavillion, Wyoming from potential water contamination. EPA's focus going forward will be on using its resources and technical expertise to support and provide input to the State during its investigation, which will build on EPA's initial monitoring results. EPA applauds the leadership of Wyoming in assuring the safety of the water consumed by Pavillion residents.

**3/4. Is the investigation now considered formally closed, for EPA purposes?**

Does the EPA retain any authority or influence over the process now, as the state of Wyoming continues?

We will be using our resources and technical expertise to support and provide input to the State during its investigation, which will build on EPA's initial monitoring results. The data collected during EPA's preliminary study of potential groundwater contamination in Pavillion, Wyoming will be considered by the State and the State will consult with EPA as that investigation progresses, provide draft reports for our review and comment and consider suggestions made by EPA for third-party experts.

**5. Why did the EPA initially extend the public comment and review process two times?**

EPA extended the public comment period for the draft research report to continue its public outreach activities, including meeting with key stakeholders and posting additional technical information on our website. These extensions also allowed the public additional opportunity to comment on EPA's draft report, its data and for the agency to consider new data, further stakeholder input, and public comment, as well as to review its options moving forward.

**6. Is the EPA backing away from its initial conclusions regarding the source of groundwater constituents detected in Pavillion water wells?**

After five phases of sampling, EPA's domestic water well sampling results have documented constituents of concern; however a source of those constituents has not been determined. The State, with our support, will be considering possible sources of contamination during its investigation.

While EPA stands behind its work and data, the Agency recognizes the State's commitment to further investigation and efforts to provide clean water and does not plan to finalize or seek peer review of its draft Pavillion groundwater report released in December, 2011. Nor does the Agency plan to rely upon

the conclusions in the draft report.

Separately, EPA is conducting a major research program on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and drinking water in different areas of the country and will release a draft report in late 2014. The agency will look to the results of this program as the basis for its scientific conclusions and recommendations on hydraulic fracturing.

**8. Has the EPA ensured in any way that there will be continuity between Wyoming officials' investigation and the one started by the EPA, and that Wyoming will continue to examine for the same constituent contaminants in Pavillion water that the EPA has raised initial questions and had initial findings about?**

We will be using our resources and technical expertise to support and provide input to the State during its investigation, which will build on EPA's initial monitoring results. The data collected during EPA's preliminary study of potential groundwater contamination in Pavillion, Wyoming will be considered by the State and the State will consult with EPA as that investigation progresses, provide draft reports for our review and comment and consider suggestions made by EPA for third-party experts.

**From:** Abrahm Lustgarten [mailto:Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 20, 2013 6:24 PM  
**To:** Johnson, Alisha  
**Subject:** Re: Pavillion, WY  
**Importance:** High

Here's some questions:

1. Why is the EPA turning over the investigation to Wyoming officials, without completing its peer review process or reaching a final conclusion?
2. How much money did the federal government spend on this investigation to date?
3. Is the investigation now considered formally closed, for EPA purposes?
4. Does the EPA retain any authority or influence over the process now, as the state of Wyoming continues?
5. Why did the EPA initially extend the public comment and review process two times?
6. Is the EPA backing away from its initial conclusions regarding the source of groundwater constituents detected in Pavillion water wells?
7. Will the Pavillion situation be included in any way or inform in any way the EPA's ongoing national review of the safety of hydraulic fracturing?
8. Has the EPA ensured in any way that there will be continuity between Wyoming officials' investigation and the one started by the EPA, and that Wyoming will continue to examine for the same constituent contaminants in Pavillion water that the EPA has raised initial questions and had initial findings about?

**From:** "Johnson, Alisha" <Johnson.Alisha@epa.gov>

**Date:** Thu, 20 Jun 2013 18:13:50 -0400  
**To:** Abrahm Lustgarten <[abrahm.lustgarten@propublica.org](mailto:abrahm.lustgarten@propublica.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: Pavillion, WY

Hey there,

Won't be able to do an interview, but happy to get back to you on any questions you might have.

**From:** Abrahm Lustgarten [<mailto:Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 20, 2013 6:11 PM  
**To:** Johnson, Alisha  
**Subject:** Pavillion, WY

Hi Alisha,

I've sent a note to Rich Mylott asking for an interview with one of the Pavillion research team members about the decision to turn that project over to Wyoming. Would you assent to that? And would you be able to make someone in Washington available to chat with me about it for a couple of minutes — probably Bob Perciaseppe since I've seen his name mentioned in early reports about it?

Thanks,

Abrahm